



Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States

Report of the Committee created by the Twelfth
Congress of the Order, May 21, 22, 1913, at
Chicago, Illinois, upon Amendments to the
Constitution of the Order submitted
by Commanderies to the Congress.

100

Commanderies Submitting Amendments at the
Twelfth Congress of the Order

MASSACHUSETTS
ILLINOIS
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
OHIO
MICHIGAN
KANSAS
VERMONT

E 46%

6
A 16%

the standard error of



TO THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF:

The Committee on Amendments of the Constitution (1905) reports as follows:

AMENDMENTS PROPOSED BY THE COMMANDERY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Article V, Section 2 of the Amendments proposed by the Commandery of Massachusetts conflicts with Article VI, Section 2 of the Constitution.

Article V, Section 3, would render quite possible the inheritance from a Loyal Soldier of the right to membership in the Order, although the heir so inheriting was the direct descendant of an Officer in the Rebel Service.

Your Committee might have considered this Amendment in a different light, if the word "Loyal" had been inserted.

Section 4. The same objection applies as to Section 3, that is, that the descendant of a Rebel might become a member.

Section 8. This Amendment would limit membership in the Second Class to the eldest sons, and if there were no eldest sons, to the grandsons in the order of primogeniture.

The proposed Amendment as to who shall constitute the Second Class, conflicts with Section 4, Article V, of the Constitution.

This Committee regrets that the desirable provision for the transmission of eligibility to membership to descendants of the Third Class cannot be acted upon independently.

Section 9. This proposed Amendment eliminates the classification of succession, and is in conflict with Section 6, Article VI, of the Constitution, the Amendment of which has not been proposed by any Commandery.

Section 11. This is unnecessary unless the proposed Amendment to Section 8 be adopted.

Article VI, Section 1. Prior to July 4th, 1889, a person eligible to membership could make application to any Commandery. On that day an Amendment became effective providing that application must be made to the Commandery of the State in which the applicant resides, if there be one, and if there be none, to such Commandery as the applicant may select.

This change was made because experience had shown that in some cases, persons who could not have been elected to membership in the Order from the Commandery of the State where they resided, and were known, made application to some other Commandery, which possibly was less careful in its investigation of the application, were elected and then transferred to the Commandery of the State where they resided.

The proposed Amendment to Section 1, Article XVIII, provides that all meetings of the Congress of the Order shall be held in the City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

We believe, in regard to this Amendment, that the ambulatory character of the Congress, meeting over the country, where there is a Commandery, at different times, tends to stimulate interest in the Order and is of benefit to the members, and in many cases eliminates the question of long distance travel to a remote point from the Western Commanderies, and it is unfair to expect them to send representatives the long distance from Washington and Oregon and California to Philadelphia, and this Amendment would prevent that exchange of intercourse between the members, which should be continued.

Furthermore, as the Commandery-in-Chief meets every second year in Philadelphia, it would be unfair to the Commandery of the State of Pennsylvania to impose upon it the additional expense of holding a Congress there every four years.

Article XXI, Section 5. As no Amendments are proposed to Section 4, Article XXI, if the Amendments to Section 5, Article XII, are adopted, Hereditary Companions of the Second and Third Classes would wear the Rosette indicating Service and the Ribbon indicating that the wearer did not so Serve.

The proposed Amendment provides that the Rosette now worn by original Companions of the First Class, which indicates actual service in the War of the Rebellion, shall be worn by all the Companions of the Order.

As to this your Committee believe that a large majority of the Hereditary members of the Order neither desire this, nor would be willing to accept; and furthermore this Rosette has become known and recognized not only throughout the United States, but all over the World, as indicating that the wearer was a Commissioned Officer of the Loyal side during the War of the Rebellion. To grant its use now to others would be a practical fraud on the Public and would substantially deprive this Rosette of its significance, as an evidence of service, and reduce it to the level of the badges of the innumerable societies with which our country is flooded.

Your Committee, therefore, recommends that the Amendments proposed by the Commandery of the State of Massachusetts be not adopted.

AMENDMENTS PROPOSED BY THE COMMANDERY OF ILLINOIS

Article V, Section 9. As to the Amendment proposed by the Commandery of Illinois to Article V, Section 9, your Committee are of the opinion that no one, except a son of an Original Companion of the First Class, who has joined the Order during his Father's lifetime, should be designated as a Succession Companion, and we therefore advise that the Amendment be not adopted.

Article XI, Section 1. Under the decision of the Commandery-in-Chief, as to the construction of the Constitution, Companions of the Second Class are ineligible to office, and as this proposed Amendment was designed to make them eligible, your Committee believe that during the life of his Father, when a Companion of the Second Class is a member of the Order, such Companion of the Second Class ought not to hold office in the Commandery, as he in no sense represents his Father, but is a member of the Order in order that he may attend its Meetings and to a limited degree exercise the power of voting.

Your Committee therefore recommends that the Amendments proposed by the Commandery of the State of Illinois be not adopted.

AMENDMENTS PROPOSED BY THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Amendments proposed to Article V, which were apparently intended to change the designations of the various present Classes, if adopted would bring up a direct conflict with Section 2 and Section 6 of Article VI and with Article XXI of the Constitution.

The Amendment also provides that "All of the Articles after Article V shall be made to conform to Article V, as amended, eliminating the words 'first class' and 'second class,' as applied to Original members and Hereditary members, leaving only those designated in Article V, Section 4, as members of the Second Class."

Your Committee is of the opinion that such a blanket Amendment imposing upon the Commandery-in-Chief the necessity of changing other Articles of the Constitution, in order to comply with it, is not a proper Amendment to be submitted to the Congress of the Order. Neither the Congress nor the Commandery-in-Chief have power to change the wording of the Constitution in any manner not specifically described.

Your Committee is also of the opinion that it might be wise to eliminate the word "Class" and substitute some other designation, such as Original Companions, Hereditary Companions and Junior Companions, but as no such amendments have been proposed, no action to that end can be taken by the Congress.

Your Committee therefore recommends that the Amendments proposed by the Commandery of the District of Columbia be not adopted.

AMENDMENTS PROPOSED BY THE COMMANDERY OF OHIO

The proposed Amendment to Section 4, Article V, provides that a person elected a Companion of the Second Class by nomination of an Original Companion, shall have the same rights as to his successor as pertains to Original Companions of the First Class, and renders it possible, as already stated, not only that the eligibility to membership in the Order may descend to persons having no trace of the blood of the Officer through whom his eligibility was derived, but also eliminates the necessity imposed upon other applicants of proving their descent.

Article VI, Section 1. As to this Article, providing that the entire Section be stricken out and the following be substituted:

"Any application for membership may be made to such Commandery as the applicant may elect."

Your Committee have already expressed their opinion in this report.

Article VI, Section 3. As all the members of the Order since its organization, have been elected under the provisions of the present Constitution, which requires but Five adverse votes to exclude a member, your Committee are of the opinion that to adopt this Amendment would not only tend to the possibility of the admission of undesirable members, owing to the difficulty of getting a majority adverse vote against anyone, but would also be a gross injustice to the present members of the Order.

The Committee of Investigation may not perform its duty thoroughly; in such case, if there are Five members who know the applicant is unworthy of membership, he cannot be elected; but if it only requires a majority vote, he is almost certain to be elected.

Your Committee therefore recommends that the Amendments proposed by the Commandery of the State of Ohio be not adopted.

AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY THE COMMANDERY OF MICHIGAN

Article VI, Section 1. As to the Amendment proposed by the Commandery of Michigan, which is identical with the Amendments proposed by Massachusetts and Ohio, as to which your Committee have already expressed their opinion adversely, we have nothing to add to the reasons there given.

Your Committee therefore recommends that the Amendment proposed by the Commandery of the State of Michigan be not adopted.

AMENDMENTS PROPOSED BY THE COMMANDERY OF KANSAS

It is proposed to change Article V of the Constitution (Section 3) to conclude with these words:

"And they shall be entitled to all the rights and privileges in the Order which belong to the Original Companion from whom his membership descends, with the right to wear the same Insignia and Rosette."

Under the present Constitution only Original Companions can vote for or against an applicant for membership as an original Companion.

The Ribbon from which the Insignia is suspended and the Rosette now worn by Original Companions, indicate actual Service in the War of the Rebellion.

The effect of the proposed Amendment will be to give the Hereditary Companion the right to vote upon the admission of an applicant for membership as an Original Companion of the First Class, and to wear the Ribbon and Insignia now indicating actual Service in the War of the Rebellion. Companions of the Second Class and Third Class would continue to wear the Rosette and the Ribbon, which does **not** indicate actual Service in the Army, Navy or Marine Corps of the United States during the War of the Rebellion.

The proposed Amendments to Article XXI of the Constitution, as published by the Commandery of the State of Kansas, are confusing.

Section 2 reads:

"Change Article XXI, Section 4, paragraph 2, to read:

'For Original Companions of the First Class and Hereditary Companions of the First Class', " etc.

The paragraph if so changed would read:

"For Original Companions of the First Class and Hereditary Companions of the First Class, the Ribbon shall have a red center, eight-tenths of an inch wide, with a border of white and edging of blue, each three and one-half tenths of an inch wide."

Section 3 reads:

"Change the third paragraph of the last named Section to read:

'For Original Companions of the First Class and Hereditary Companions of the First Class,' " etc.

It is difficult to tell what words in the Section as it now exists it was intended to change, for the words last quoted above,

but presumably they were the words "For Companions of the First Class other than Original Companions." If this is so the paragraph would read:

"For Original Companions of the First Class and Hereditary Companions of the First Class, and Companions of the Second and Third Classes, the Ribbon shall have a blue center eight-tenths of an inch wide, with a border of white and edging of red, each three and one-half tenths of an inch wide."

Section 4 reads:

"Change paragraph 2, Section 4, Article XXI to read:

'For Companions of the First Class, other than original Companions and Hereditary Companions of the First Class,' etc., and change the third paragraph of the same Section to read:

'For Companions of the First Class and Hereditary Companions of the First Class,' " etc.

If changed, as stated above, the second and third paragraphs would read as follows:

"For Companions of the First Class, other than Original Companions and Hereditary Companions of the First Class, the Ribbon shall have a red center eight-tenths of an inch wide with a border of white and edging of blue, each three and one-half tenths of an inch wide."

"For Companions of the First Class and Hereditary Companions of the First Class, and Companions of the Second and Third Classes, the Ribbon shall have a blue center eight-tenths of an inch wide, with a border of white and edging of red, each three and one-half tenths of an inch wide."

Taken in connection with the proposed Amendment to Section 3, Article V, it is evident that the intent of the proposed Amendment to Article XXI was to provide that Original Companions and Hereditary Companions should wear the Ribbon and Rosette indicating Service in the War of the Rebellion and Companions of the Second and Third Classes should wear the Ribbon and Rosette which do not indicate such Service.

The proposed Amendments to Article XXI, however, do not so provide and they are conflicting. They provide (change proposed in Section 2) that Original and Hereditary Companions should wear the Ribbon and Rosette indicating Service, and

(change proposed in Section 3) that Original and Hereditary Companions and Companions of the Second and Third Classes should wear the Ribbon and Rosette, which **does not** indicate such service.

Practically the same conflict occurs in the changes proposed in Section 4 of the Kansas Circular, which seems to be a repetition of those proposed in Sections 2 and 3.

Your Committee therefore recommends that the Amendments proposed by the Commandery of the State of Kansas be not adopted.

AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY THE COMMANDERY OF VERMONT


This proposed Amendment is subject to the same objection as the Amendment to the same Section made by the Commandery of the State of Massachusetts.

Your Committee therefore recommends that the Amendment proposed by the Commandery of the State of Vermont be not adopted.


In conclusion, your Committee desire to say that while they were in entire sympathy with some of the purposes which apparently prompted many of the proposed Amendments, they were powerless under the Constitution of the Order to re-cast any Amendment.

J. LANGDON WARD
JOHN O. FOERING
CHAS. B. AMORY
ROSWELL H. MASON
ANDREW COWAN
S. L. WOODWARD
URBAN A. WOODBURY

Committee.



H 29 89



HECKMAN
BINDERY INC.



NOV 89



N. MANCHESTER,
INDIANA 46962

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 012 161 924 6